arXiv:1611.03205v1 [quant-ph] 10 Nov 2016

Generalized thermalization for integrable system under quantum quench

Sushruth Muralidharan,[1,*] Kinjalk Lochan,[1] and S. Shankaranarayanan[1]

[1]*School of Physics, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research, Thiruvananthapuram (IISER-TVM), Trivandrum 695016, India*

We investigate equilibration and *generalized thermalization* of quantum Harmonic chain — an integrable system which in the thermodynamic limit mimics a free scalar field — under global quantum quench. The quench action we consider is connecting two disjoint harmonic chains of different sizes and the system jumps between two integrable settings. We verify the validity of the Generalized Gibbs Ensemble description for this system and also identify *equilibration between the subsystems* as in classical systems. Using Bogoliubov transformations, we show that the eigenstates of the system prior to the quench evolve towards the Gibbs Generalized Ensemble description. Further, through the phase space properties of a Generalized Gibbs Ensemble and the strength of stimulated emission, we identify the necessary criterion on the initial states for the *thermalization* at late times, which is satisfied by the system in the thermodynamic limit.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

Thermalization of isolated quantum systems are apparently different from their classical counterparts [1]. In a classical system the constituent degrees of freedom interact and trade off charges to settle into a thermally equilibration configuration [2]. Within the framework of unitary quantum theory, a system in a pure state will never evolve to a "thermal state". Instead, it has been suggested that *thermalization* of quantum systems needs to be understood through observables rather than the states themselves [3]. To go about this, we need to separately quantify *equilibration* and *thermalization*. An observable is said to *equilibrate* to a particular expectation value, within a timescale, if the temporal fluctuations about that value is small at most times, while, the observable is said to *thermalize* if it equilibrates to the quantum statistical description of the system. In the case of isolated quantum systems, the observables should equilibrate to its long time average which should be equivalent to the microcanonical expectation value [2].

Although there is no fundamental understanding of thermalization in quantum systems, it has been proposed that the thermalization for some systems can be understood through *eigenstate-thermalization hypothesis* (ETH)[4–6]. More specifically, non-integrable systems appear to obey ETH [7], while numerical studies [7–11] show that integrable quantum systems equilibrate to a Generalized Gibbs Ensemble (GGE). To overcome the complexities of thermalization of these systems, most of the studies were done for finite dimensional Hilbert space.

In this work, we investigate equilibration and thermalization of systems with infinite dimensional Hilbert space. The system we consider consists of two harmonic chains that undergo sudden global quantum quench (referred to as quench, hereafter) at an instant of time. The quench action we consider is joining the chains and evolve the chains as a combined chain. Specifically, we investigate the case where an integrable system makes jump to another integrable configuration. In other words, this is a system which remains integrable both before and after the quench. However, the sudden change of parameter of coupling (from zero to non-zero value) change the normal modes. Here, we study the evolution of an initial energy eigenstate for which the thermalization is debated. Evolution towards GGE is demonstrated for a system in a non-integrable system quenching to an integrable system [12]. One of the main motivation for the Harmonic chain is its easy adaptability to field theoretic problems like in non-inertial or uniformly accelerated frames [13–15]. Particularly, we ask the following questions:

— What happens to the energy eigenstates of an integrable system when the system jumps to another integrable configuration?

— Whether the system settles to an equilibrium state and if yes, to what state the system settles to?

— whether steady states of pre-quench system develop Gibbs – Ensemble characteristics at late times ?

The initial states we introduce for the quenched system will both be Gaussian (e.g., ground state) and non-Gaussian states (e.g. excited states). We study the evolution of such states post quench, numerically as well as analytically. We use the properties of Bogoliubov transformation and, in the thermodynamic limit, show that the initial quantum state evolves to GGE form.

Since the *thermalization*, if it occurs, must be completely described by the first two moments of the distribution in phase space, we focus at structure of the covariance matrix to identify a necessary (not sufficient though) condition for the thermalized system. By this means, we can classify the set of initial states which will (or will not) evolve to a thermal configuration. Our analysis also provides a possible link of thermalization with delocalization in the Hilbert space similar in the spirit to the classical equivalent; delocalization in the phase space for classical thermalization. We demonstrate that

*Electronic address: sush_ins, kinjalk, shanki@iisertvm.ac.in

the condition for thermalization in the sense of GGE gets increasingly satisfied in the thermodynamic limit.

II. THE MODEL AND SETUP

The system we consider consists of two harmonic chains, with lattice sizes N and M, respectively. For $t < 0$, the two chains are non-interacting whose Hamiltonian is:

$$H_0 \;=\; H_N + H_M, \tag{1}$$

with,

$$H_K = \sum_{i=1}^{K} \frac{p_i^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2} m\omega_0^2 (q_{i+1} - q_i)^2 \quad K = N \text{ and } M \tag{2}$$

At $t = 0$ we turn on an interaction between the two chains with a coupling strength ω_0 (chosen for simplicity). After the quench $t \geq 0$, the total Hamiltonian is:

$$H = H_0 + H_{int} = \sum_{i=1}^{N+M} \frac{p_i^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2} m\omega_0^2 (q_{i+1} - q_i)^2 \tag{3}$$

where $H_{int} = -m\omega_0^2 q_{N+1} q_N$. In terms of creation and annihilation operators, the Hamiltonian operators are,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_0 \;&=\; \sum_{l=1}^{N} \hbar\, \omega_l \left(\hat{a}_l^\dagger \hat{a}_l + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \sum_{l=1}^{M} \hbar\omega_{N+l} \left(\hat{a}_{N+l}^\dagger \hat{a}_{N+l} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \\ \hat{H} \;&=\; \hat{H}_N + \hat{H}_M + \hat{H}_{int} = \sum_{l=1}^{N+M} \hbar\omega_l (\hat{c}_l^\dagger \hat{c}_l + \frac{1}{2}), \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where ω_l's are normal mode frequencies (see Appendix A). Let the system be in an eigenstate $|\psi\rangle_i$ of the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0$. After quench, the time evolution of the system is described by the Hamiltonian in Eq.(4). In order to compute the time evolution we need to map $|\psi\rangle_i$ to linear combination of the eigenstates of $\hat{H}$. Hence, to express $|\psi\rangle_i$ in terms of the eigenstates of $\hat{H}$ we need to,

1. Get a relationship between the creation and annihilation operators before and after the quench, and
2. Express the ground state $|0\rangle_1 = |0\rangle_N \otimes |0\rangle_M$ of the disjoint system as a linear combination of eigenstate of the joint system.

Other eigenstates can be obtained through the action of $\hat{a}_l^\dagger$ on $|0\rangle_1$. We can relate creation and annihilation operators before and after the quench using the Bogoliubov transformations (see Appendix B for details). It is in general non-trivial to relate the ground state $(|0\rangle_N \otimes |0\rangle_M)$ corresponding to $\hat{H}_0$ to the ground state corresponding to $\hat{H}$ $(|0\rangle_{N+M})$. However, using the fact that the ground state is a Gaussian for the integrable systems, one can write the following general expression connecting the two:

$$|0\rangle_N \otimes |0\rangle_M = N_0 e^{-\frac{F_{ij}}{2} \hat{c}_i^\dagger \hat{c}_j^\dagger + G_{ij} c_i c_j^\dagger + \cdots} |0\rangle_{N+M} \tag{5}$$

where F_{ij}, G_{ij} are $(N+M) \times (N+M)$ matrices. It can be seen that only F_{ij} contributes when one calculates the expectation values of the physical quantities at the leading order of expansion. F_{ij} can be determined by solving the following constraint equations.

$$\hat{a}_i |0\rangle_N \otimes |0\rangle_M = 0, \quad \forall\, i = 1, 2, \ldots (N+M). \tag{6}$$

We expect F_{ij} to be symmetric matrix since $\hat{c}^\dagger$ operators commute with each other. Using these results and Eq.(5), any generic eigenstate of H_0 is given by

$$|\psi\rangle_{\{(n_i, n_j)\}} = \prod_{i=1}^{N+M} \prod_{j=1}^{M} (\hat{a}_i^\dagger)^{n_i} e^{-\frac{F_{lk}}{2} \hat{c}_l^\dagger \hat{c}_k^\dagger} |0\rangle_{N+M}. \tag{7}$$

Using Eq.(7) and the Bogoliubov transformations (in the Appendix B) we can therefore write this state as a linear combination of eigenstates of the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$.

Numerically, we can study the time evolution with only finite number of basis states, hence, we restrict Eq.(7) to the first order expansion of the exponential term. As mentioned earlier, to study thermalization in the quantum systems, we need to look at some physical observables to probe the system. In this case, we use the occupation number of the modes in one part of the disjoint system (before the quench), i. e,

$$\hat{n}_m \;=\; \hat{a}_m^\dagger \hat{a}_m, \;\; m = 1, 2 \ldots, (N) \tag{8}$$

These are the conserved charges of the system and also determine the energy of the system prior to quench. Since these operators do not commute with the Hamiltonian after the quench H, the time evolution is non-trivial. Once we obtain the average occupation numbers, it possible to obtain the evolution of the energies of the disjoint modes as,

$$E_N(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[\hat{n}_i(t) + \frac{1}{2} \right] \hbar\omega_i; E_M(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \left[\hat{n}_{N+i}(t) + \frac{1}{2} \right] \hbar\omega_{N+i}. \tag{9}$$

We use *Quantum Package* in Mathematica to evolve the system numerically.

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

Initial states and delocalization: As mentioned above, we begin the system in eigenstate of the disjoint Hamiltonian ($\hat{H}_0$). Once the system is quenched, the eigenstate can be written as linear combination of the normal mode eigenstates of the quenched Hamiltonian ($\hat{H}$) — *delocalization* in the Hilbert space of the quenched Hamiltonian. Tab. I gives the delocalization for different initial states and lattice sizes (for $N = 5$ and different M), where $\mathcal{N}[\psi_i]$ is the approximate number of eigenstates involved in writing the first order approximation of Eq.(7). Delocalization in phase space has previously been studied from the point of view of thermalization [16]. From the table we infer that as we increase the lattice size and the

number of excitation modes in the initial state, eigenstates are more *delocalized* in the Hilbert space of the quenched Hamiltonian. We explore the relation between the delocalization and equilibration in rest of this section.

M	$\|\psi_i\rangle$	$\mathcal{N}[\psi_i]$	M	$\|\psi_i\rangle$	$\mathcal{N}[\psi_i]$
10	$a_i^\dagger$	695	10	$a_3^\dagger a_4^\dagger$	3181
16	$a_i^\dagger$	1791	16	$a_3^\dagger a_4^\dagger$	10858
20	$a_i^\dagger$	2950	20	$a_3^\dagger a_4^\dagger$	20801

TABLE I: Table shows the delocalization of initial state ψ_i for $N = 5$ and different M lattice sites.

Equilibration, steady states and fluctuations: In order to go about understanding equilibration, we evaluate the observables $E_N(t), E_M(t), E_N(t) + E_M(t)$ as a function of time. In Fig. 1, we have plotted the time evolution of these observables from the initial value till $t = 2000$ for two different initial states. We infer the following: As



FIG. 1: For the initial state $|\psi_i\rangle = a_3^\dagger a_4^\dagger |0\rangle_N \otimes |0\rangle_M$. $E_N(t)$ (in pink) and its long time average , $E_M(t)$ (in blue) and its long time average, the total energy of the state after the quench (in green) and $E_N(t) + E_M(t)$ (in yellowish green)

we increase the lattice size — corresponding to increase in delocalization of the initial states — the expectation value of the energy tends towards the long-time average. This is similar to the notion of equilibration in classical systems where two systems at different temperatures in contact, at late times, reach the same temperature. In this case, the two chains are in two different energy eigen states, however, at late times, both the systems tend to a state with similar average energy per mode (as can be seen in Fig. 4) in the relaxation timescales of the system.

To further investigate, let us define,

$$\frac{||\delta E_M(t)||}{||\delta E_M(0)||} = \frac{||E_M(t) - \overline{E_M}||}{||E_M(0) - \overline{E_M}||}$$

which is the time evolution of the fluctuations of E_M about the long time average value of observable H_M. In Fig. 2 and Fig. 3, we have plotted the time evolution of the fluctuation from the initial value till $t = 2000$ for two different initial states. We infer the following: The



FIG. 2: Plot of the fluctuations for initial state $|\psi_i\rangle = a_3^\dagger a_4^\dagger |0\rangle_N \otimes |0\rangle_M$ for t= [0,2000] for different lattice sizes.



FIG. 3: For lattice sizes N=5,M=16, $\frac{||\delta E_M(t)||}{||\delta E_M(0)||}$ for t=(0,2000) time steps

fluctuations remain subdued periodically. As the lattice size increases, this recurrence is rarer. Also for the same lattice there are smaller fluctuations with farther recurrences for initial states which have better delocalization (See Tab. I). The quasi-periodic nature of observables in finite systems imply that there may be recurrence in long times [10, 17], however the time it takes to relax to a steady state from a non-equilibrium initial condition should be much less than the recurrence timescale of the

system. As seen here, the recurrence timescale grow with the system size and it is expected that it grows exponentially with the system size [18, 19]. Hence, recurrences become rarer in a thermodynamic limit.



FIG. 4: E_N/N and E_M/M along with their long time averages for t=(0,500) time steps

To understand this further and to know whether we can define *equilibration* between two quantum subsystems, in Fig. 4, we plot the evolution of the average energy per mode for the two subsystems, E_N/N and E_M/M. To understand what happens within the relaxation timescales, we have plotted for 500 time steps. We observe the following salient features:

- The long time averages of the observables (per lattice point) relax to GGE expectation value.
- The fluctuations about the average values become smaller with increasing lattice size of the system.
- The per-point observable quantities approach a common value for a specific realization (system size).

IV. ANALYTICAL UNDERSTANDING

The numerical evolution of the states clearly indicate that the system relaxes to GGE. However, the numerical analysis does not provide a physical understanding as to (i) why the long time average of the observables relax to GGE? (ii) For what initial conditions, thermalization is violated? and (iii) Is there a way to identify the relation between the delocalization in the Hilbert space and equilibration of states? To go about understanding these issues, we resort to analytical methods and study the observable characteristics of the system at late times.

For the system of Harmonic chains, the normal mode analysis (see Appendix A) makes the study of the system as that of independent oscillators. For this system, prior to the quench, the ground state is a multi-mode Gaussian state. As the quench action is also "quadratic", the time evolution keeps the state to be a Gaussian although the normal modes of the system before and after quench are different. Therefore, the expectation values of any operator can be obtained from the Gaussian density matrix prior to or post quench, with appropriate Bogoliubov coefficients (See Appendix B). In Appendices C and D, using Bogoliubov transformations, we obtain the evolution and the long time averages of these observables. Using the results in Appendices (B, C and D), we can rewrite the conserved quantities (through the average expectation of the post quench number operator) in terms of the Bogoliubov coefficients (see details in Appendix E):

$$\langle \hat{n'}_k \rangle = \sum_l |\beta_{kl}|^2 + \sum_j \left(|\alpha_{kj}|^2 n_j + |\beta_{kj}|^2 n_j \right). \quad (10)$$

Physically, the first term in the RHS corresponds to the occupancy when the initial state is vacuum state. This is referred to as *vacuum polarization* [20] under the quench. The remaining terms are from the occupancy of the initial states prior to quench, and is referred to as *stimulated emission* [21]. Having obtained the results for general initial state, we can go about understanding the above questions.

First, the periodicity observed in the expectation values directly stem from the beat frequencies of the normal modes. As can be seen from Appendix A, in the thermodynamic limit, the beat frequencies become smaller and the recurrences become rarer.

Second, setting the initial state to be ground state, we compute the long-time average of the observables and compare them with the thermal states (See Appendix E). For thermal states, the evolution in phase space can be described (by virtue of Gaussianity of the density matrix or Wigner function) by the mean and the second moments. Furthermore, the form of the thermal covariance matrix is tightly constrained. Not only it should be diagonal, but the diagonal entries tell us about the Gibbs conserved charges [22], that can be used to compare against the numerical relaxation values. The analysis shows that the Gaussian state indeed relaxes to GGE. In Appendix (F), we verify the same using the covariance matrix analysis.

Third, covariance matrix analysis is not sufficient in dealing with non-vacuum energy eigenstates, as these states are not Gaussian. In the case of non-vacuum initial states, as seen from Eq.(10), the observables will receive correction over the GGE description. These corrections can be characterized as arising from stimulated emissions. In Appendix (G), we do a detailed analysis on such stimulated emission induced corrections. We observe that for larger lattice size, these correction become suppressed as $1/N$, where N is the lattice size. Further, lower the initial excitation is, smaller is the deviation from GGE. In the thermodynamic limit, the per-point observable quantities get effectively described by a GGE

(vacuum description), albeit with different values of the parameters in the vacuum state (due to the N dependence). Again, we can identify the generic states which will show significant departures from a GGE description.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

While the mechanism and validity of *generalized thermalization* in integrable systems — where ETH is not valid is still not well understood — many numerical studies have been done with spin systems to verify the validity of the GGE description of their steady states [7, 8, 11, 19]. There have been studies investigating whether sudden change in parameters of the Hamiltonian of an integrable system to another leads to GGE. These studies however are mostly done for finite dimensional Hilbert space systems. The harmonic oscillator chain with a finite lattice size, that we have considered, is an infinite dimensional Hilbert space system. So a non-equilibrium initial state can delocalize into infinitely many possible combination of independent states when we take it into an out of equilibrium condition. Our system also quenches between two integrable configurations. Therefore, we can utilize the techniques of Bogoliubov transformations for our study. We have investigated the *relaxation* of eigenstates of such a system.

We have verified the validity of the GGE to describe the long time average values starting from a non-equilibrium initial state. We also explicitly showed the fluctuations about steady state with the time evolution of this system. For this system, the longtime averages match the GGE expectation values, yet the fluctuations about this long time average value, although small in the relaxation timescales, are still not negligible.

We were also able to see a form of *equilibration between the subsystems* for our system. It appears as though the two subsystems are approaching a limit in which the average energy per excitation modes are the same within the relaxation time scales, similar to classical systems. If for a given initial eigenstate, the system indeed evolves to GGE description, the characteristics describing system should be identified and compared against those of GGE. Under general arguments of stimulated emission between integrable systems and thermodynamic limit, we obtained GGE description for finite excitations as well. Using covariance matrix and methods of stimulated emission, we showed that the evolution of the general state (not only eigenstates) to a GGE form in the thermodynamic limit. By corollary we have obtained the states which do not evolve to a GGE form. The measure of such states in the Hilbert space is an interesting quantity in order to comment about the generic feature of thermalization. We will pursue this issue elsewhere.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors wish to thank Krishnanand Mallaya and Sandra B for useful discussions. The work is supported under DST-Max Planck Partner Group on Cosmology and Gravity. SM was supported by Inspire fellowship of DST, Government of India.

[1] P. P. V. McClintock, Contemporary Physics **51**, 186 (2010).
[2] C. Gogolin and J. Eisert, Reports on Progress in Physics **79**, 056001 (2016), arXiv:1503.07538 [quant-ph] .
[3] J. von Neumann, Zeitschrift fu r Physik **57** (1929).
[4] J. M. Deutsch, Phys. Rev. A **43**, 2046 (1991).
[5] M. Srednicki, Physical Review E **50**, 888 (1994).
[6] M. Rigol and M. Srednicki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 110601 (2012).
[7] M. Rigol, V. Dunjko, and M. Olshanii, Nature **452**, 854 (2008).
[8] M. Rigol, V. Dunjko, V. Yurovsky, and M. Olshanii, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 050405 (2007).
[9] M. Gring, M. Kuhnert, T. Langen, T. Kitagawa, B. Rauer, M. Schreitl, I. Mazets, D. A. Smith, E. Demler, and J. Schmiedmayer, Science **337**, 1318 (2012).
[10] L. D'Alessio, Y. Kafri, A. Polkovnikov, and M. Rigol, Advances in Physics **65**, 239 (2016), arXiv:1509.06411 [cond-mat.stat-mech] .
[11] A. C. Cassidy, C. W. Clark, and M. Rigol, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 140405 (2011).
[12] M. Rigol, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 100601 (2016).
[13] J. Doukas, E. G. Brown, A. Dragan, and R. B. Mann, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 012306 (2013).
[14] M. Ahmadi, K. L. A. C. A. Lorek, Ahmadi, A. R. H. Smith, R. B. Mann, and A. Dragan, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 124031 (2016).
[15] G. Salton, R. B. Mann, and N. C. Menicucci, New Journal of Physics **17**, 035001 (2015).
[16] C. Neuenhahn and F. Marquardt, Phys. Rev. E **85**, 060101 (2012).
[17] L. Campos Venuti and P. Zanardi, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 022113 (2010).
[18] V. I. Yukalov, Laser Physics Letters **8**, 485 (2011).
[19] M. Cramer, C. M. Dawson, J. Eisert, and T. J. Osborne, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 030602 (2008).
[20] N. D. Birrell and P. C. W. Davies, *Quantum Fields in Curved Space*, Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK, 1984).
[21] R. Müller and C. O. Lousto, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 1922 (1994).
[22] S. Olivares, The European Physical Journal Special Topics **203**, 3 (2012).

Appendix A: The Harmonic chain

A harmonic oscillator chain is a well known integrable system. With periodic boundary conditions, this Hamiltonian in the thermodynamic limit would correspond to a free field theory. The Hamiltonian of a N body harmonic oscillator lattice with nearest neighbor interactions can be written as,

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{p_i^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2} m\omega_0^2 (q_{i+1} - q_i)^2 \tag{A1}$$

where ω_0 is the natural frequency of the individual oscillator, p_i and q_i are the respective momentum and position coordinates for a harmonic oscillator on the i^{th} lattice site with a lattice distance of a. In this work we use static boundary conditions, which means $q_1 = q_{N+1} = 0$. For large N, the results are independent of the choice of the boundary condition.

Rewriting the Hamiltonian in terms of the normal modes leads to a system of N uncoupled harmonic oscillators:

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \hbar\, \omega_k (\hat{a}_k^\dagger \hat{a}_k + \frac{1}{2}) \tag{A2}$$

where $a_k^\dagger$ and a_k are the creation and annihilation operators with normal mode frequencies,

$$\omega_k = 2\omega_0 \left| \sin\left(\frac{\pi k}{2(N+1)}\right) \right|. \tag{A3}$$

As we will explicitly calculate in other sections of the appendix, the beat frequencies appearing in the various expectations are determined by

$$|\omega_k - \omega_j| = 2\omega_0 \left| \sin\left(\frac{\pi k}{2(N+1)}\right) - \sin\left(\frac{\pi j}{2(N+1)}\right) \right| = 4\omega_0 \left| \sin\left(\frac{\pi(k-j)}{2(N+1)}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\pi(k+j)}{2(N+1)}\right) \right|. \tag{A4}$$

The $(k-j)$ takes values $N+1-m$ with $m \in 2, 3, ...$ Therefore, in the thermodynamic limit, most of the beat frequencies become smaller and therefore the recurrences occur lately. For smaller lattice sizes, two normal mode frequencies can easily be separate enough to show periodicity effectively, while for the larger systems, the probability of finding separate enough normal modes will be rarer, hence the oscillatory terms get suppressed in overall contribution.

Appendix B: Bogoliubov Transformations

As mentioned earlier, the normal modes of the system before and after the quench are different. In order to obtain the relation between the creation and annihilation operators before and after the quench, we need to diagonalize the Hamiltonian by applying the Bogoliubov transformations. Using the definitions for normal modes coordinates before and after the quench, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_l &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{N+1}} \sum_{m=1}^{N} q_m \sin\left(\frac{\pi l m}{N+1}\right) \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{N+1}} \sqrt{\frac{2}{N+M+1}} \sum_{m=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N+M} Q'_k \sin\left(\frac{\pi m k}{N+M+1}\right) \sin\left(\frac{\pi l m}{N+1}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{B1}$$

We can use the relationship of the creation and annihilation operators before and after the quench to get,

$$\hat{a}_l + \hat{a}_l^\dagger = \sqrt{\frac{2}{N+1}} \sqrt{\frac{2}{N+M+1}} \sum_{m=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N+M} e^{\gamma_{l,k}} (\hat{c}_k + \hat{c}_k^\dagger) \sin\left(\frac{\pi m k}{N+M+1}\right) \sin\left(\frac{\pi l m}{N+1}\right) \tag{B2}$$

where $e^{\gamma_{l,k}} = \sqrt{\frac{\omega_l}{\omega'_k}}$.

Similarly we can use P'_l to get an expression for $a_l - a_l^\dagger$ and adding these to expressions lead to:

$$\hat{a}_l = \sqrt{\frac{2}{N+1}}\sqrt{\frac{2}{N+M+1}}\sum_{m=1}^{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N+M}\left(\cosh(\gamma_{l,k})\hat{c}_k + \sinh(\gamma_{l,k})\hat{c}_k^\dagger\right) \times \sin\left(\frac{\pi mk}{N+M+1}\right)\sin\left(\frac{\pi lm}{N+1}\right) \tag{B3}$$

The Hermitian conjugate of Eq.(B3) lead to the expansion for $a_l^\dagger$. Similarly for a_{N+l} we get,

$$\hat{a}_{N+l} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{M+1}}\sqrt{\frac{2}{N+M+1}}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{k=1}^{N+M}\left(\cosh(\gamma_{N+l,k})\hat{c}_k + \sinh(\gamma_{N+l,k})\hat{c}_k^\dagger\right) \times \sin\left(\frac{\pi(N+i)k}{N+M+1}\right)\sin\left(\frac{\pi li}{M+1}\right) \tag{B4}$$

Thus, we obtain the *Bogoliubov* transformations that relate the creation and annihilation operators of the system before and after the quench.

Appendix C: Observables

To study thermalization in this system we consider some observables to probe the system. In this case, we use the occupation number of the modes of the disjoint system, i. e.,

$$\hat{n}_m = \hat{a}_m^\dagger \hat{a}_m,\ m = 1, 2\ldots, (N+M) \tag{C1}$$

Since these operators do not commute with the Hamiltonian ($\hat{H}$) after the quench, the time evolution is expected to be non-trivial. Using the Bogoliubov transformations and the evolution properties of $\hat{c}^\dagger$ and $\hat{c}$ operators, the time evolution of the occupation numbers is given by,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\hat{n}_m(t)\rangle =& \frac{4}{(N+M+1)(N+1)}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N+M}\sum_{l=1}^{N+M}\Big[\cosh(\gamma_{mk})\cosh(\gamma_{ml})e^{\frac{i(\omega_l'-\omega_k')t}{\hbar}}\langle\hat{c}_l^\dagger\hat{c}_k\rangle \\ &+ \sinh(\gamma_{mk})\cosh(\gamma_{ml})e^{\frac{i(\omega_l'+\omega_k')t}{\hbar}}\langle\hat{c}_l^\dagger\hat{c}_k^\dagger\rangle + \cosh(\gamma_{mk})\sinh(\gamma_{ml})e^{\frac{i(-\omega_l'-\omega_k')t}{\hbar}}\langle\hat{c}_l\hat{c}_k\rangle \\ &+ \sinh(\gamma_{mk})\sinh(\gamma_{ml})e^{\frac{i(-\omega_l'-\omega_k')t}{\hbar}}\langle\hat{c}_l\hat{c}_k^\dagger\rangle\Big] \times \sin(\frac{\pi jl}{N+M+1})\sin(\frac{\pi jm}{N+1}) \\ &\times \sin(\frac{\pi ik}{N+M+1})\sin(\frac{\pi im}{N+1})\end{aligned} \tag{C2}$$

for $m : 1 \to N$, and

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\hat{n}_{N+m}(t)\rangle =& \frac{4}{(N+M+1)(M+1)}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{M}\sum_{k=1}^{N+M}\sum_{l=1}^{N+M}\Big[\cosh(\gamma_{N+m,k})\cosh(\gamma_{N+m,l})e^{\frac{i(\omega_l'-\omega_k')t}{\hbar}}\langle\hat{c}_l^\dagger\hat{c}_k\rangle \\ &+ \sinh(\gamma_{N+m,k})\cosh(\gamma_{N+m,l})e^{\frac{i(\omega_l'+\omega_k')t}{\hbar}}\langle\hat{c}_l^\dagger\hat{c}_k^\dagger\rangle \\ &+ \cosh(\gamma_{N+m,k})\sinh(\gamma_{N+m,l})e^{\frac{i(-\omega_l'-\omega_k')t}{\hbar}}\langle\hat{c}_l\hat{c}_k\rangle \\ &+ \sinh(\gamma_{N+m,k})\sinh(\gamma_{N+m,l})e^{\frac{i(-\omega_l'-\omega_k')t}{\hbar}}\langle\hat{c}_l\hat{c}_k^\dagger\rangle\Big] \times \sin(\frac{\pi(N+j)l}{N+M+1}) \\ &\times \sin(\frac{\pi jm}{M+1})\sin(\frac{\pi(N+i)k}{N+M+1})\sin(\frac{\pi im}{M+1})\end{aligned} \tag{C3}$$

for $m : 1 \to M$. In order to evaluate the quantum expectation of the number operator at any instant of time t, we need to obtain the correlation matrices $\langle\hat{c}_i^\dagger\hat{c}_j^\dagger\rangle$,$\langle\hat{c}_i\hat{c}_j^\dagger\rangle$, $\langle\hat{c}_i^\dagger\hat{c}_j\rangle$ and $\langle\hat{c}_i\hat{c}_j\rangle$.

Once we obtain the average occupation numbers, it possible to obtain the evolution of the energies of the disjoint modes as, $\langle\hat{H}_N(t)\rangle = E_N(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N}(\hat{n}_i(t) + 1/2)\hbar\omega_i$ and $\langle\hat{H}_M(t)\rangle = E_M(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{M}(\hat{n}_{N+i}(t) + 1/2)\hbar\omega_{N+i}$ using the occupation numbers we have computed above.

Appendix D: Long time averages

From Eq.(C2) and Eq.(C3), it is easy to see that that the long time average will include only the diagonal elements as only for the those values will the exponential factor vanish.

Hence, the long time average of the expectation value of the number operator is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\langle \hat{n}_m(t)\rangle} =& \frac{4}{(N+M+1)(N+1)} \sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N+M} \left[\cosh^2(\gamma_{mk})\langle \hat{c}_k^\dagger \hat{c}_k\rangle + \sinh^2(\gamma_{mk})\langle \hat{c}_k \hat{c}_k^\dagger\rangle\right] \\ & \times \sin(\frac{\pi jk}{N+M+1}) \sin(\frac{\pi jm}{N+1}) \sin(\frac{\pi ik}{N+M+1}) \sin(\frac{\pi im}{N+1})\end{aligned} \tag{D1}$$

for $m : 1 \to N$, and

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\langle \hat{n}_{N+m}(t)\rangle} =& \frac{4}{(N+M+1)(M+1)} \sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{M}\sum_{k=1}^{N+M} \left[\cosh^2(\gamma_{N+m,k})\langle \hat{c}_k^\dagger \hat{c}_k\rangle + \sinh^2(\gamma_{N+m,k})\langle \hat{c}_k \hat{c}_k^\dagger\rangle\right] \\ & \times \sin(\frac{\pi (N+j)k}{N+M+1}) \sin(\frac{\pi jm}{M+1}) \sin(\frac{\pi (N+i)k}{N+M+1}) \sin(\frac{\pi im}{M+1})\end{aligned} \tag{D2}$$

for $m : 1 \to M$.

Appendix E: Gibbs Generalized Ensemble

As mentioned earlier, GGE can be used to describe the steady states for integrable systems evolving from a non-equilibrium initial state. With such a description one can generalize the concept of thermalization for integrable systems. We would like to therefore compute GGE expectation values of the observables mentioned above and thereby verify the validity of such a description for these states.

GGE is completely described in terms of conserved quantities of the system. Therefore, for our system, we need to find them post quench. The energies (and hence occupation number) of each normal mode in the joint system (after the quench) are conserved as there will be no interactions between these modes and the system is similar to a system of $N+M$ independent harmonic oscillators, with the independent conserved quantities $\hat{n'}_k = \hat{c}_k^\dagger \hat{c}_k,\ k = 1, 2, \ldots, (N+M)$. The conserved quantities are given in terms of the Bogoliubov coefficients and the occupancies prior to the coupling as

$$\langle \hat{n'}_k\rangle = \sum_l |\beta_{kl}|^2 + \sum_j \left(|\alpha_{kj}|^2 n_j + |\beta_{kj}|^2 n_j\right). \tag{E1}$$

Physically, the first term in the RHS of Eq.(E1) can be be understood as the occupancy when the system starts in the vacuum state and quench is introduced. This is referred to as *vacuum polarization* [20] under the quench. The remaining terms are from the occupancy of the initial states prior to quench, and is understood to be the part from *stimulated emission* [21].

Thus, the density matrix of GGE is,

$$\hat{\rho}_{GGE} = \frac{e^{-\sum_{m=1}^{N+M} \lambda_m \hat{n'}_m}}{Tr(e^{-\sum_{m=1}^{N+M} \lambda_m \hat{n'}_m})} \tag{E2}$$

where $\{\lambda_m\}$ are Lagrange multipliers.

We can find the Lagrange multipliers, using the initial conditions of the conserved quantities,

$$Tr(\hat{\rho}_{GGE} \hat{n'}_k) = \langle \hat{n'}_k(0)\rangle \tag{E3}$$

to be

$$\lambda_k = \ln\left(\frac{1 + \langle \hat{n'}_k(0)\rangle}{\langle \hat{n'}_k(0)\rangle}\right) \tag{E4}$$

for $k = 1, 2 \ldots (N+M)$. Therefore, the Lagrange's multipliers are obtained from the Bogoliubov coefficients.

Once the state $|\psi_i\rangle$ is known in terms of Eq.(7), the conserved quantities are known and the Lagrange multipliers are fixed based on the initial state . Operators $\hat{c}$ and $\hat{c}^\dagger$ are traceless matrices in the energy eigen-basis and the trace of a tensor product will be a product of the traces of the individual components. This implies that the correlation matrices $\langle \hat{c}_i \hat{c}_j^\dagger \rangle_{GGE} = \delta_{i,j} \langle \hat{c}_j c_j^\dagger(0) \rangle$ and $\langle c_i^\dagger c_j \rangle_{GGE} = \delta_{i,j} \langle \hat{c}_j^\dagger \hat{c}_j(0) \rangle$ will be diagonal and $\langle \hat{c}_i \hat{c}_j \rangle_{GGE} = \langle \hat{c}_i^\dagger \hat{c}_j^\dagger \rangle_{GGE} = 0$. So using this and Eq.(E3),

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \hat{n}_m(t) \rangle_{GGE} =& \frac{4}{(N+M+1)(N+1)} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N+M} \Big[\cosh^2(\gamma_{mk}) \langle \hat{c}_k^\dagger \hat{c}_k(0) \rangle + \sinh^2(\gamma_{mk}) \langle \hat{c}_k \hat{c}_k^\dagger(0) \rangle \Big] \\ & \times \sin\Big(\frac{\pi jk}{N+M+1}\Big) \sin\Big(\frac{\pi jm}{N+1}\Big) \sin\Big(\frac{\pi ik}{N+M+1}\Big) \sin\Big(\frac{\pi im}{N+1}\Big)\end{aligned} \tag{E5}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \hat{n}_{N+m}(t) \rangle_{GGE} =& \frac{4}{(N+M+1)(M+1)} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \sum_{k=1}^{N+M} \Big[\cosh^2(\gamma_{N+m,k}) \langle \hat{c}_k^\dagger c_k(0) \rangle \\ & + \sinh^2(\gamma_{N+m,k}) \langle \hat{c}_k \hat{c}_k^\dagger(0) \rangle \Big] \times \sin\Big(\frac{\pi(N+j)k}{N+M+1}\Big) \\ & \times \sin\Big(\frac{\pi jm}{M+1}\Big) \sin\Big(\frac{\pi(N+i)k}{N+M+1}\Big) \sin\Big(\frac{\pi im}{M+1}\Big)\end{aligned} \tag{E6}$$

Since, $\hat{c}_i^\dagger \hat{c}_j$ (and so $\hat{c}_i \hat{c}_j^\dagger$) are conserved quantities and do not evolve in time we can immediately conclude that *long time averages* computed in Appendix D match the expectation values from the Gibbs Generalized Ensemble.

Appendix F: Covariance Matrix

For Gaussian states, the information is encoded in the second moment which is also encoded in the covariance matrix in the phase space. Structurally, the covariance matrix is given as

$$\sigma_{NM} = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{xx} & \sigma_{xp} \\ \sigma_{xp} & \sigma_{pp} \end{pmatrix} \tag{F1}$$

The covariance matrix before the quench, in the normal modes of the 'non-quenched' Hamiltonian, is given as

$$\sigma_{NM} = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & .. & a_{1n} & b_{11} & .. & b_{1n} \\ .. & .. & .. & .. & .. & .. \\ a_{n1} & .. & a_{nn} & b_{n1} & .. & b_{nn} \\ b_{11} & .. & b_{1n} & \tilde{a}_{11} & .. & \tilde{a}_{1n} \\ .. & .. & .. & .. & .. & .. \\ b_{n1} & .. & b_{nn} & \tilde{a}_{n1} & .. & \tilde{a}_{nn} \end{pmatrix} \tag{F2}$$

If we go to the phase space corresponding to the configuration space variables of the system, the covariance matrix becomes

$$\sigma = S^T \sigma_{NM} S, \tag{F3}$$

where S is given by

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} S_N & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & S_M & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & S_N & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & S_M \end{pmatrix} \tag{F4}$$

which is a similarity transformation from the configuration space to the normal modes and

$$S_K = \sqrt{\frac{2}{K+1}} \begin{pmatrix} \sin\frac{\pi}{K+1} & .. & \sin\frac{K\pi}{K+1} \\ .. & .. & .. \\ \sin\frac{K\pi}{K+1} & .. & \sin\frac{K^2\pi}{K+1} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{F5}$$

K takes values N, M. Clearly, being a symmetric orthogonal matrix S is its inverse as well. Since it is easier to go to the normal modes of quenched system from the configuration space we cast the covariance matrix in the configuration space through Eq.(F3).

Post quenching, the system can be expressed in terms of normal modes of the quenched system and we cast the covariance matrix in the new normal mode basis of the quenched system to study its time evolution. The recasting in the normal mode basis is done again by an orthogonal transformation

$$\tilde{S}_{N+M} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{N+M+1}} \begin{pmatrix} \sin\frac{\pi}{N+M+1} & .. & \sin\frac{(N+M)\pi}{N+M+1} & 0 & .. & 0 \\ .. & .. & .. & .. & .. & .. \\ \sin\frac{(N+M)\pi}{N+M+1} & .. & \sin\frac{(N+M)^2\pi}{N+M+1} & 0 & .. & 0 \\ 0 & .. & 0 & \sin\frac{\pi}{N+M+1} & .. & \sin\frac{(N+M)\pi}{N+M+1} \\ .. & .. & .. & .. & .. & .. \\ 0 & .. & 0 & \sin\frac{(N+M)\pi}{N+M+1} & .. & \sin\frac{(N+M)^2\pi}{N+M+1} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{F6}$$

Therefore, the covariance matrix post quenching is given as

$$\sigma_{PQ} = \tilde{S}_{N+M}(S^T \sigma_{NM} S)\tilde{S}^T_{N+M}. \tag{F7}$$

Further, in the normal modes basis, we have $N+M$ decoupled harmonic oscillators whose time evolution is obtained as a transformation given by matrix

$$U_t = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\omega_1 t & .. & 0 & \frac{\sin\omega_1 t}{\omega_1} & .. & 0 \\ .. & .. & .. & .. & .. & .. \\ 0 & .. & \cos\omega_{N+M} t & 0 & .. & \frac{\sin\omega_{N+M} t}{\omega_{N+M}} \\ -\omega_1 \sin\omega_1 t & .. & 0 & \cos\omega_1 t & .. & 0 \\ .. & .. & .. & .. & .. & .. \\ 0 & .. & -\omega_{N+M}\sin\omega_{N+M} t & 0 & .. & \cos\omega_{N+M} t \end{pmatrix}, \tag{F8}$$

It is important to note that this is not unitary in the phase space. Thus the time evolution drives the covariance matrix to

$$\sigma_{PQ}(t) = U_t^{-1}\sigma_{PQ}U_t = \chi^T \sigma_{NM}\chi, \tag{F9}$$

with

$$\chi = S\tilde{S}^T_{N+M}U_t. \tag{F10}$$

The generic form of the off-diagonal terms in the covariance matrix post quench are given as

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma_{PQ;xx})_{ij} &= a_{ij}\cos\omega_j t\cos\omega_i t - b_{ij}\sin\omega_j t\cos\omega_i t - b_{ij}\omega_i\cos\omega_j t\sin\omega_i t + \tilde{a}_{ij}\omega_i\sin\omega_j t\sin\omega_i t \\ (\sigma_{PQ;xp})_{ij} &= a_{ij}\sin\omega_j t\cos\omega_i t + b_{ij}\cos^2\omega_i t - b_{ij}\sin^2\omega_i t - \tilde{a}_{ij}\omega_i\sin\omega_j t\cos\omega_i t. \end{aligned} \tag{F11}$$

For the vacuum state, evidently $b_{ij} = 0$, Therefore, the off-diagonal elements of the quenched covariance matrix become purely oscillatory in nature. The long-time averages over such covariance matrices can be effectively replaced by a diagonal Gaussian covariance matrix, which acquire GGE form. The diagonal elements give the occupancy across different modes, which is exactly the first term on the RHS of Eq.(E1).

Appendix G: Fate of a general Fock basis state under quench

As discussed previously, any non-vacuum eigenstates will bring corrections as depicted in Eq.(E1). If the initial state is taken to be an eigenstate of the pre-quenched Hamiltonian, i.e.

$$|\Psi_{in}\rangle = |n_1, n_2, ...\rangle_M \otimes |n_{N+1}, n_{N+2}, ..\rangle_N \tag{G1}$$

the off diagonal parts of the initial covariance matrix are given as (by writing the individual x_i and p_j's in terms of the creation and annihilation operators)

$$\sigma_{x_i x_j} = \langle\Psi|\frac{\hat{x}_i\hat{x}_j + \hat{x}_j\hat{x}_i}{2}|\Psi\rangle\big|_{i\neq j} = 0, \tag{G2}$$

$$\sigma_{x_i p_j} = \langle\Psi|\frac{\hat{x}_i\hat{p}_j + \hat{p}_j\hat{x}_i}{2}|\Psi\rangle = 0. \tag{G3}$$

owing to $b_{ij} = 0$ in Eq.(F11) for the energy eigenstates Eq.(G1). We note the following points: The initial states, for which $b_{ij} = 0$, the long time average of the covariance matrix will lead to *thermal* form. Clearly these states satisfy the necessary criterion of a diagonal covariance matrix. However, for the initial states, which have $b_{ij} \not< \infty$ will violate *thermalization.* We will pursue the support of such initial states in the full Hilbert space elsewhere. Coming back to the eigenstates, the comparison of the diagonal elements of the time averaged covariance matrix expectedly recovers Eq.(E5),Eq.(E6), which supports the GGE description. We now further probe the excited eigenstates with their long time average expectation values.

Clearly, in the free harmonic oscillator system, all observables are described by the correlators $\langle \hat{c}_k(t)\hat{c}^\dagger_{k'}(t)\rangle$. As discussed in the previous appendices, the long time average for any observable will be solely determined by $\langle \hat{c}_k(0)\hat{c}^\dagger_k(0)\rangle$. Therefore, we can use Eq.(E1) for determining such quantities per unit lattice point. Clearly, for initial excited states, the Gaussian (GGE) description will be corrected. The deviation from such a description is characterized by

$$\Delta_G = \frac{\sum_j \left(|\alpha_{kj}|^2 n_j + |\beta_{kj}|^2 n_j\right)/N}{\sum_l |\beta_{kl}|^2/N} \tag{G4}$$

In the limit $N \to \infty$,

$$\sum_l |\beta_{kl}|^2/N \;\to\; Const. \tag{G5}$$

$$\sum_j \left(|\alpha_{kj}|^2 n_j + |\beta_{kj}|^2 n_j\right)/N \;\to\; \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sum_j n_j}{N}\right). \tag{G6}$$

Therefore, in the thermodynamic limit, for any finitely excited state (sub-part of the full system) the effective description is essentially GGE. Also, we note that quantum states for which $\Delta_G \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ will not relax to a generalized thermal setting effectively.